



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/005,208 | 12/04/2001 | Michael Becker | 6470 | 5597 |

7590 07/07/2004

Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens LLP
225 Franklin Street, Suite 3300
Boston, MA 02110

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

NGUYEN, KHAI MINH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2684 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/005,208 | Applicant(s) BECKER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Khai M Nguyen | Art Unit 2684 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: "10-24" on page 3, line 8 and "16-20" on page 3, line 9. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2684

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 8-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Wolf (US-6647327)

Regarding claim 1, Wolf teaches motor vehicle MOST data communication
network (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39), comprising:

a ring bus (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39, col.1, line 57);

a plurality of multimedia units connected to said ring bus (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39,
col.1, line 58); and

a wireless transceiver connected to said ring bus (fig.1, col.1, lines 61-63),
wherein said wireless transceiver receives outgoing data from said ring bus (fig1, fig.2,
col.1, lines 54-65) and transforms said outgoing data to a wireless data format and
transmits the transformed data (fig1, fig.2, col.1, line 54 to col.2, line 10), and receives
incoming data and transforms said incoming data and provides transformed incoming
data indicative thereof to said ring bus (fig.1, fig.2, col.2, lines 11-22).

Regarding claim 8, Wolf teaches a method of communicating over a wireless
communication channel between a motor vehicle MOST network having a wireless
transceiver and a wireless device (fig.1, fig.2, col.1, lines 17-39), comprising:

receiving outgoing data at the wireless transceiver in a first data format compatible with the MOST network and transforming the outgoing data to a second data format compatible with the wireless communication channel and providing a transformed output signal indicative thereof (fig.1, fig.2, col.1, line 54 to col.2, line 22); and

transmitting said transformed output signal over the wireless communication standard (fig.1, fig.2, col.1, lines 29-39, col.2, lines 33-39).

Regarding claim 9, Wolf teaches the method of claim 8, further comprising:

receiving incoming data at the wireless transceiver in the second data format and transforming the incoming data to the first data format, and providing a transformed input signal indicative thereof (fig.1, col.1, line 66 to col.2, line 10).

Regarding claim 12, Wolf teaches a motor vehicle MOST data communication network that communicates over a wireless communication channel with a wireless device (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39), comprising:

a ring bus (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39, col.1, line 57);

a plurality of multimedia units connected to said ring bus (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39, col.1, line 58); and

means for receiving outgoing data from said ring bus in a first data format compatible (fig.1, fig.2, col.2, lines 11-22) with the MOST network, and for transforming said outgoing data to a second data format compatible with a wireless communication

channel (fig.1, fig.2, col..1, line 64 to col..2, line 39) and for transmitting a transformed output data signal indicative thereof over the wireless communication standard (fig.1, fig.2, col.1, line 64 to col.2, line 39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-7, 10-11, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf (US-6647327) in view of Van der Tuijn (US-6683886).

Regarding claims 2-4, Wolf teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network of claim 1 (fig.1, col.1, lines 29-39, col.1, line 54 to col.2, line 10).

Wolf fails to specifically disclose the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard. However, Van der Tuijn teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted

according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to use the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65) as taught by Van der Tuijn with Wolf teaching in order to handle both voice and data communications .

Regarding claim 5, Wolf teaches the MOST data communication network of claim 2, wherein said plurality of multimedia units includes a DVD player (col.1, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 6, Wolf teaches the MOST data communication network of claim 2, wherein said plurality of multimedia units includes an audio player (col.1, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 7, Wolf teaches the MOST data communication network of claim 2, wherein said plurality of multimedia units includes a navigation system (col.1, lines 17-23).

Regarding claims 10-11, Wolf teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network of claim 1 (fig.1, fig.2, col.1 to col.2, line 39).

Wolf fails to specifically disclose the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is

formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard.

However, Van der Tuijn teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to use the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65) as taught by Van der Tuijn with Wolf teaching in order to handle both voice and data communications.

Regarding claims 13-15, Wolf teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network of claim 1 (fig.1, fig.2, col.1 to col.2, line 39).

Wolf fails to specifically disclose the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard.

However, Van der Tuijn teaches the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to

a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time the invention was made to use the motor vehicle MOST data communication network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, incoming data is formatted according to a time division multiplex encoding, incoming data is formatted according to a Digital European Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) standard (col.1, lines 16-29, lines 52-65) as taught by Van der Tuijn with Wolf teaching in order to handle both voice and data communications.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khai M Nguyen whose telephone number is 703.305.3906. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703.308.7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2684

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khai Nguyen
Art unit 2684

06/18/2004


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER